

MINUTES
Marine Protected Areas Federal Advisory Committee Meeting
November 18-20, 2008
Monterey, California

TUESDAY, November 18, 2008

The committee convened at 8:30 A.M.

Meeting Opening

Lauren Wenzel, Designated Federal Official, opened the meeting and called the roll. Twenty-three members were present, representing a quorum. She then handed the gavel to the Chair, Mark Hixon. Dr. Hixon welcomed the new and continuing members, including Laura Furgione, the new ex officio representative for the Department of Commerce, and Steve Tucker, who will become the new ex officio representative for the Coast Guard in Spring 2009. Members then introduced themselves, including their respective affiliations and experience relevant to marine protected areas (MPAs). Joe Schumacker, who was nominated to represent tribes on the MPA Federal Advisory Committee (FAC), was also introduced. Dr. Hixon asked for the approval of the Committee to send a letter of thanks to former Committee Chair Dr. Daniel Bromley, which was unanimously given. Walter Pereyra agreed to serve as Parliamentarian for this meeting.

Dr. Hixon reviewed the major tasks on the agenda, including the finalization and approval of the two Subcommittee white papers, remaining portions of the federal charge for each Subcommittee, discussion of Committee membership and elections, updates on the National System of Marine Protected Areas, as well as the launch of the national system on Thursday evening.

Ms. Wenzel briefly updated the Committee on updates to the federal charge, including the section on gap analysis, which incorporates the concepts of resilience and representativeness.

Approval of Minutes

Dr. Hixon asked members to review the minutes from the April 2008 meeting. It was noted that Melissa Miller-Henson was not in attendance, which should be amended. Victor Mastone moved approval of the minutes as amended, which was seconded by David Wallace. The minutes were unanimously approved.

Committee Membership and Elections

Joe Uravitch, MPA Center Director, noted that members are appointed to a single four-year term and that every other year fifteen members rotate off of the Committee. Nominations for new members are currently being solicited with a focus on filling geographic and expertise gaps. On October 31, 2009, fifteen members are scheduled to rotate off. However, with the changing administration the approval process for new members may take longer than usual. The FAC charter allows current members to continue to serve until their replacements are appointed. There was general agreement among Committee members regarding the

extension of their services if needed. The nomination process for new members has been extended until January 31, 2009.

The FAC charter calls for the election of a Chair and Vice Chair every two years, and by the end of this meeting, Mark Hixon and Bob Zales will have served in those roles for two years. In opening discussion on this issue, Dr. Hixon noted that: (a) the Chair and Vice Chair serve at the pleasure of the Committee; (b) because the original members of the Committee will rotate off the FAC in Fall 2009, new leadership must be elected by then at the latest; and (c) there are a variety of trade-offs regarding the best time to hold elections, especially given that this is the first meeting for some new members, who may not yet know whether they were willing to serve in a leadership role.

David Benton moved that the current Chair and Vice-Chair remain in their posts through the Fall 2009 meeting. The new Chair and Vice Chair would be elected at the Fall 2009 meeting and assume their positions immediately following that meeting. Discussion focused on issues surrounding the Committee elections, including the need for continuity entering a new Administration, the importance of balancing the interests and expertise of the Chair and Vice Chair, and the benefits of having experience on the Committee before assuming a leadership position. Walter Pereyra seconded the motion and it was carried unanimously. Dr. Hixon and Mr. Zales both noted their willingness to lend advice and consultation to incoming leadership following the Fall 2009 election.

Subcommittees Meet

The Subcommittees met from 10:00 A.M until 12:00 P.M. The Committee broke for lunch and resumed at 1:40.

Presentation: Summary of the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee Process

Rondi Robison presented the work of the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee regarding the relationship between the National System of MPAs and ocean observing systems, including the U.S. Integrated Ocean Observing System (IOOS®). Ms. Robison described the work of the Subcommittee, including an in-person meeting in August 2008 and the subsequent drafting of a white paper, which was presented to the Committee prior to the November 2008 meeting. The following expert panel was invited to provide further advice and recommendations to the full Committee in order to finalize the white paper.

Invited Panel Discussion: Integrating the National System of MPAs and Ocean Observing Systems

The panel included Ms. Zdenka Willis (IOOS), Dr. Cheri Recchia (MPA Monitoring Enterprise, California), Dr. Brian Keller (NOAA Office of National Marine Sanctuaries), Mr. Paul Siri (Ocean Science Applications) and Ms. Heather Kerkering (Central and Northern California Ocean Observing System). The panel explored how ocean observing systems, in particular the IOOS, can be better linked with the National System of MPAs to support their common goals and those of regional ocean governance initiatives. They were invited to help explore these linkages and answer a series of questions posed by the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee and the Committee. The experts began by noting the timeliness of the white paper, as both ocean observing systems and the national system are currently developing, and

the value of the paper in emphasizing the opportunity for a mutually-beneficial co-evolution in the development of the national system and ocean observing systems.

Referring to the regional scale at which the IOOS operates, Dennis Heinemann asked if a parallel management scale need be present among MPAs in order to link the systems effectively, or if the localized management scale of MPAs would work. Ms. Willis and Ms. Kerkering explained that a direct match is not necessary and that ocean observing systems are in fact being developed to address regional, statewide and local needs. However, the IOOS is currently unable to fund all of those needs and must therefore prioritize its efforts, focusing first at the regional scale.

Russell Moll inquired about the applicability of the IOOS measurements, such as sea surface temperature, to MPA management decisions, such as changing the boundaries of an MPA. Ms. Willis explained that these are the types of questions the IOOS is currently investigating. At the programmatic level, the IOOS needs to understand the questions that its constituents, including MPA managers, have to answer. Furthermore, direct ‘in the water’ ocean observations are developing along with shifts in funding and programming as the IOOS investigates practical applications for its measurements.

Brian Keller noted that evaluating the effectiveness of MPAs is crucial. Dr. Keller cited the use of sonic tags in the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary as a valuable ocean observing tool that has helped the sanctuary track the movement of fishes and spiny lobsters. This has shown that some of the existing boundaries of the MPA need modification to improve effectiveness. Dr. Keller also noted that ocean observing systems can help MPA managers identify natural vs. anthropogenic factors that affect management. Paul Siri continued that the IOOS is a nationally coordinated system that is implemented regionally. The system is supposed to be client driven, however the critical component of input from the clientele is often missing. Cheri Recchia emphasized the importance of determining the key information that needs to be collected in order to manage an MPA effectively. Much of the information most relevant to MPA effectiveness is not being provided by current observing systems, and in some cases MPA managers do not know what information they need.

Jim Ray noted that one of the biggest challenges of the MPA Center will be to demonstrate the value added to MPA sites of joining the national system, and that influencing observing systems to meet MPA needs could be such a benefit. Charlie Wahle, MPA Center Senior Scientist, noted that another challenge in meeting the information needs of MPA managers is that many of the required parameters are ecological, having to do with biodiversity and structure, and that this specific component is currently lacking in the IOOS. David Benton added that there are many factors affecting the protection of an area, and expressed his concern in achieving the long term collection of the right types of data.

Paul Siri explained that ocean observing systems are growing in their prediction and forecast capabilities. The IOOS began measuring physical parameters and will begin to focus on ecological elements in the near future. Moreover, the IOOS can currently help with some social and economic aspects of ocean management. Zdenka Willis asked that members keep in mind that the IOOS focuses on integrating data from multiple observing assets and putting

it into modeling to address the seven Societal Goals of the IOOS. The IOOS is not the only observing element across NOAA or the nation, but is bringing those disparate data sets together to address data gaps and needs. Neither the MPA community nor the IOOS has the funding to put in place the varied monitoring observations required, but by bringing the two communities together we can move forward.

Mark Hixon noted that the IOOS can help by looking at the general ocean environment and beginning to examine regional trends and the causes underlying local effects. David Benton asked about the continuing function of oceanographic observations that are already occurring in and around MPAs. Zdenka Willis stated that programs will continue to develop and manage their own monitoring assets. The IOOS can then help with the standardization, visibility and accessibility of the collected data. Paul Siri noted that the IOOS Regional Associations are tracking many, varied regional activities that affect the ocean environment. Melissa Miller-Henson added that MPA managers may not yet know all of the required information needs; however, enough is known to begin to work together in developing these systems in concert.

The Subcommittee agreed to revise the white paper based on the panel's comments.

Public Comment

No public comments were offered.

The Committee recessed for the day at 5:00 P.M.

WEDNESDAY, November 19, 2008

The Committee convened at 8:30 A.M.

Presentation: Key Priorities for FY2009

Joe Uravitch began the morning with a presentation on key priorities for the MPA Center in fiscal year 2009. This included an overview of funding, which Mr. Uravitch noted was still uncertain at this stage. The President's Request and Senate Mark was set at \$2.128M (an increase of \$644K over current funding), while the House Mark was set at \$2.900M (an increase of \$1.416M). However, under the current Continuing Resolution the Center will receive the FY2008 level (through early March 2009) set at \$1.484M. Mr. Uravitch also briefly reviewed the organization of the MPA Center for FY2009 as well as its key activities. Several planned activities depend on funding levels, including a Spring 2009 FAC meeting (currently planned), the external review of the MPA Center, and the expansion of the Ocean Use Atlas, for which the Center is seeking external partners.

White Paper Discussion: *Linking Ocean Observing Systems with the National System of Marine Protected Areas*

Dennis Heinemann thanked the Subcommittee members for their leadership and support and summarized the main changes in the document. They included strengthening the recommendations, clarifying the key issues, and formatting in bullets for readability. He then

opened the floor to comment from the Committee. Walter Pereyra noted the importance of incorporating data collected from fishing vessels. Dr. Heinemann explained that the paper represented a broad overview of integrating the two programs, without being too specific as to which data would be collected. He further noted that the purpose of the paper is primarily to address how the IOOS could build its network and data to meet the needs of the national system and its sites.

David Benton expressed his concern that the paper implied that IOOS was responsible for management, and was overstating this role. Mr. Benton agreed that the IOOS is an important tool to inform management, but that the Committee should use caution in stating that either system is necessarily critical to the functioning of the other. Brian Melzian explained that the language was strengthened so that the recommendations would carry more weight when they reached the Secretaries of Commerce and Interior. Dr. Melzian also noted that the paper is not meant to be comprehensively inclusive, and that a function of the interagency working group recommended in the paper could be to further the common goals of each. Mark Hixon agreed that the intent of the document is to build a mutually beneficial relationship and to effectively state that there is value added by building this linkage. Dennis Heinemann added that the Subcommittee could tone the language of the paper down to address this concern, but that caution should be used in doing so as in some situations the measurements provided by the IOOS and other ocean observing systems do represent an essential function of effective MPA management. Bruce Tackett agreed but noted that when talking about the relative balance of priorities, the Committee should caution against the frequent use of strong language with respect to funding. Terry O'Halloran added his concern that the 'recommendations' section of the paper omitted mention of the stakeholder community and the public.

Considering the above comments, the Subcommittee agreed to revise the white paper before submitting it for FAC action.

White Paper Discussion: *Draft Recommendations on National System Evaluation*

Lori Arguelles presented the Review and Evaluation Subcommittee draft white paper on *Recommendations on Evaluating the National System of Marine Protected Areas* for discussion. Ellen Goethel noted that the document should mention that there will be MPAs that are not part of the national system that will affect the evaluation. Russell Moll asked for clarification as to which regions will be used in the evaluation and cautioned against including a requirement for states to collect baseline information in the absence of additional funding. Lauren Wenzel and Lori Arguelles explained that the Evaluation Subcommittee is referring to the NOAA regions in terms of regional boundaries. States are not being asked to develop new data, but would be asked to provide whatever baseline information they already have.

Jim Ray noted the difficulty of the task before the Subcommittee and expressed concern over the use of the word 'baseline,' noting that the term connotes that there is some static starting condition, when in fact the oceans are dynamic. Dr. Ray continued that defining the status of the environment at a certain point in time can be misleading and asked that a footnote be included in the paper explaining exactly what the baseline would represent. This would help

recognize that, while evaluation metrics are very important, to scientifically evaluate the national system in a meaningful way would require separating out the impacts of management actions and natural influences, and would be costly. The Committee should not set expectations that cannot be met. Walter Pereyra agreed and noted the importance of adaptive management.

Steven Gaines commented that the national system will need to rely on strategic, cost effective monitoring. Not every MPA or every parameter will need to be monitored to evaluate system effectiveness. Regarding the example of climate change, Dr. Gaines stated that, because the system will be operating in a changing climate, the goals and objectives of the evaluation should be placed in that context. The national system is one of the tools that has the potential to provide benefits in the face of an uncertain climate; managers should be held accountable for how it will perform in a changing environment. Lori Arguelles clarified that the example of climate change was included to convey that the management provisions of an MPA could be correct but that there are external factors that might not be under the control of managers but that could affect the evaluation. Ms. Arguelles also noted that the Committee needs to be clear about which factors would be reviewed at the site level versus the national system level, and to recognize which of those factors are possible to incorporate. Victor Mastone clarified that the Subcommittee was viewing sites as contributors of data, but was focused on the evaluation of the system as a whole, not evaluation of individual sites. Joe Schumacker commended the group for taking a bottom-up approach, and noted that the Sanctuary Condition Reports do not sufficiently address local issues. Several members commented on the potential costs associated with national system evaluation.

Several members discussed the need to develop indicators for the national system. Rick Gaffney mentioned that the document largely relied on biological or cultural indicators but that economic indicators appeared only once, and asked for more consistency. Brian Melzian suggested the Committee could help in developing sound indicators, to which Mark Hixon added that the Committee could involve outside experts in working groups to accomplish this. Jim Ray noted that both environmental and process indicators are important, and that process indicators should be the focus in the near term (e.g., how well are we doing in building partnerships, communication, etc.).

Presentation: Nomination Process and Initial Implementation of the National System

Lauren Wenzel updated the Committee on the nomination process for sites entering the system, beginning with a brief background of the national system as well as some anticipated benefits and functions of the system, criteria for entry, the expected composition of the initial system and an overview of the system's priority conservation goals and objectives. Ms. Wenzel then explained the nomination process, the nomination package being sent to federal, state and territorial MPA managing agencies and a timeline for the process. She also noted some priorities for operating the initial system, which include building on existing stewardship efforts, focusing on national coordination and enhancing recognition. Finally, Ms. Wenzel briefly discussed the need for new Committee member nominations, touching on upcoming vacancies by interest and geography.

Russell Moll inquired about the timing for bringing sites into the national system. Ms. Wenzel explained that the first group of sites is expected to be in the national system by Spring 2009. After the first group, sites will come in on a rolling basis. Ellen Goethel asked how public comment would be solicited during the process. Ms. Wenzel replied that the notice will be published in the *Federal Register*, listed on the MPA website and other outlets, and the MPA Center will reach out to inform stakeholders. Lori Arguelles noted the ambitious schedule ahead for the nomination process and emphasized the importance of including a good representation of state sites, rather than just including federal sites. Joe Uravitch agreed, saying that the MPA Center has remained very cognizant of the need to include state sites in the initial system and has been working closely with the Coastal States Organization as well as with numerous State agencies. Joe Schumacker offered that for sites used and/or co-managed by tribes, it would be helpful if the Center sent the nomination package directly to the tribes to avoid any time delays at the state level.

Presentation: National Marine Fishery Service Sites and the Nomination Process

Heather Sagar from the National Marine Fishery Service (NMFS) briefly talked about the nomination process as it relates to sites managed by NMFS and the Fishery Management Councils (Councils). Ms. Sagar explained that NMFS envisions the nomination of sites as a collaborative process between NMFS and the Councils, and that the decisions of the Councils about whether or not their regional sites should be included in the national system would be closely considered. However, as stated in the Framework, should NMFS and the Councils disagree on the nomination of a site, NMFS would have the final ruling.

Ellen Goethel noted that at a recent New England meeting in September the Council was not given the level of detail provided by Ms. Sagar and is therefore unaware of the specifics regarding the nomination process. It would be helpful if these details were better explained to the Councils. Ms. Goethel expressed concern that the process outlined today was different than previously described, did not sufficiently engage the Councils in the process, and would create opposition from the Councils. Ms. Sagar explained that NMFS is currently getting out to all of the Councils to explain the benefits of the system and to solicit their recommendations regarding the nomination of fisheries sites. A few other members who have served on Councils emphasized the need to engage the Councils early in the process and work with them to convey the benefits of the system.

Presentation: A Conservation Gap Analysis for the National System of MPAs

Charles Wahle briefed the Committee on the proposed gap analysis process to strengthen and expand the national system. The Center will elicit the help of regional experts to identify and map ecologically important places. Next, the Center will identify which of these places are currently protected, which will then highlight those places that might be in need of additional protective measures. In the final step, MPA agencies will decide whether or not they want to fill those gaps in protection by strengthening existing MPAs, establishing new MPAs, or taking other conservation measures. Dr. Wahle also noted the many points in the process where public engagement is envisioned and provided some examples. Finally, Dr. Wahle noted the gap analysis activities planned for FY2009, including the identification of key partners, resources and data sources for the initial West Coast effort, the convening of an

expert workshop to design the national gap analysis process and the planning of initial data and mapping workshop(s) for FY2010.

Walter Pereyra asked if the process considers non-MPA management solutions to conservation gaps, and inquired about the funding needed to support this extensive process. Dr. Wahle responded that the gap analysis recognizes that MPAs are just one of many management tools. The Center will involve the Fishery Management Councils and other managers in the process. Regarding funding, Dr. Wahle noted the Center has funding to take the initial steps, and will also be reaching out to its partners. Joe Uravitch added that the Center is developing databases that are useful to a broad range of constituencies so that additional partners can be found to help move this forward.

Russell Moll endorsed the science-based approach that the Center is pursuing, and inquired about whether the analysis might indicate a need to change the size or location of MPAs. Dr. Wahle responded that this could be an outcome, especially for older MPAs that were developed before current mapping and modeling tools were available. Terry O'Halloran noted the absence of cultural resources in the process. Joe Uravitch explained that the Center has been in touch with the National Park Service to enhance this aspect of MPA management, and that the Center hopes to get staff detailed to the MPA Center to specifically focus on this issue.

The Center will remain engaged with MPA stakeholders throughout the process to ensure their input is included and that they are aware of the findings of the gap analysis. The Center also welcomes involvement from the Committee and its Subcommittees in helping to design the process.

Presentation: External Review of MPA Center

Lauren Wenzel and Joe Uravitch briefed the Committee on the planned external review of the MPA Center, which will evaluate the success of the MPA Center in meeting the purposes of Executive Order 13158 and provide recommendations that the MPA Center can use to improve its work. Key questions that will guide the review were addressed, as well as options for moving forward. Finally, a draft timeline for the review was proposed.

Brian Melzian endorsed the effort, noting that the Environmental Protection Agency has gone through a similar process which was very useful. Discussion centered on the determining factors for whether the review will be conducted by an external panel or an organization such as the National Academy of Public Administration. Joe Uravitch explained that this will be determined by funding and costs. An external review by a well known organization, while ideal, might be too expensive to implement. Bob Zales also endorsed this effort and noted that an advantage of conducting the review soon is that the MPA Center is still relatively new.

Subcommittees Meet

The Subcommittees met from 2:40 P.M. until 4:20 P.M.

Committee Deliberations: Scientific and Technical Subcommittee White Paper

The Scientific and Technical Subcommittee presented their revised white paper on *Linking Ocean Observing Systems with the National System of Marine Protected Areas*. After carefully reviewing the document, the Committee had no comments. David Wallace moved to accept the document for forwarding to the Secretaries of Commerce and Interior. The motion was seconded by Rick Gaffney, put to vote, and passed unanimously.

Committee Deliberations: Review and Evaluation Subcommittee White Paper

The Review and Evaluation Subcommittee presented their revised white paper on *Draft Recommendations on National System Evaluation*. Jim Ray continued to have concerns over the term ‘baseline,’ as it implies a static environment. David Benton noted that the new footnote defining the baseline said that it would “help evaluate” the national system over time, not that it would be the only information used. In deciding whether to vote on the document or review it and vote the next day, Walter Pereyra, serving as Parliamentarian, reminded members that should any outstanding issues arise, the document could be brought up the following day and reopened for a vote. In light of this, Victor Mastone moved to accept the document for forwarding to the Secretaries of Commerce and Interior. The motion was seconded by Jesús Ruiz, put to a vote, and passed unanimously.

The Committee recessed for the day at 5:15 P.M.

THURSDAY, November 20, 2008

The Committee convened at 8:30 A.M.

Public Comment

No public comments were offered.

Introductions

Mark Hixon introduced Timothy Keeney, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Oceans and Atmosphere; Bill Dorous, West Coast Regional Manager for the National Marine Sanctuaries; and Gary Davis, formerly with the National Park Service, who had been invited to address the Review and Evaluation Subcommittee. Mr. Keeney spoke briefly to the Committee, noting that NOAA is working hard to communicate its priorities and ensure that key activities stay on track throughout this period of change. Mr. Dorous announced that the availability of updated management plans for the three West Coast Sanctuaries, including Monterey Bay.

Presentation: After Visioning - Moving Coastal Management Forward

David Kennedy, Director of the Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management, reported on the result of the coastal visioning process that had been presented to the Committee in April 2007. This process resulted in broad themes and principles to guide a new Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA), which is now being developed within NOAA. Key proposed changes now being drafted in legislation include: creating an integrated program of research, synthesis, technical assistance and capacity building; strengthening federal coordination; requiring states to develop a coastal resource management plan with

measurable objectives that will guide future funding and evaluation efforts; requiring NOAA and states to conduct integrated coastal ecosystem assessments; standardizing the coastal zone boundary, including watersheds and the territorial sea; strengthening partnerships with NGOs and local governments; and authorizing the national system of MPAs. Mr. Kennedy also noted that the new administration has specifically named CZMA as an issue they want to address. As a next step, NOAA is seeking support from diverse groups beyond the usual coastal stakeholders.

Dennis Heinemann inquired where MPAs fit within the new CZMA. David Kennedy and Joe Uravitch explained that the draft legislation includes a section authorizing the national system that would codify Executive Order 13158, including the National MPA Center. Members also had questions regarding how climate change and funding for local governments will be addressed.

Amendment to Review and Evaluation Subcommittee Product

Jim Ray requested that a sentence be added to the end of the footnote on baselines that would read as follows: “Caution must be used when comparing baseline data with similar data from future points in time, as the ocean is a dynamic environment that naturally changes over time.” Ellen Goethel moved to insert the sentence in the final document. Terry O’Halloran seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Subcommittees Meet

The Subcommittees met from 9:30 A.M. until 12:00 P.M. The Committee reconvened after lunch at 2:10.

Report from the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee

The Scientific and Technical Subcommittee reported to the Committee on its plan to meet the remaining portion of their federal charge regarding the gap analysis and how resilience can be incorporated into the national system. The Subcommittee also presented its draft definition of ecological resilience and described how the concept applies to the national system. Mark Hixon, Jim Ray and Steve Gaines agreed to refine the definition and associated concepts, and to circulate them for Committee input. To identify items and issues that should be considered as part of the gap analysis process, and how to incorporate resilience into the gap analysis process, an Ad-Hoc Working Group was formed with members from both Subcommittees, initially including David Wallace, Steven Gaines, Eugenio Piñero Soler, Jesús Ruiz, Mark Hixon, Bob Zales and Elliott Norse. Other members from the Review and Evaluation Subcommittee are encouraged to join. The Ad-Hoc Working Group will advise NOAA and DOI on the design of a technical workshop to develop the gap analysis process and refinement of the process itself. A second group was formed to develop a set of guiding principles to be used in the gap analysis process, coordinated by Philip Renaud and joined by Rick Gaffney, Robert Wargo, Russell Moll and Ellen Goethel.

Kaush Arha applauded the work of the Subcommittee in beginning this important effort, noting both that the focus on representativeness, replication and connectivity as components of resilience is both adequate and appropriate, and that the addition of the human dimension

will be necessary and helpful. Dr. Arha further noted the difficulties in separating value judgments in these assessments, particularly with regard to replication, and stated that it would be of great use if the group could determine which values to use.

Report from the Review and Evaluation Subcommittee

The Review and Evaluation Subcommittee reported to the Committee its plan to meet the remaining portion of their federal charge regarding the development of indicators to evaluate the national system. The Subcommittee created a set of questions that will drive the process. The first of these will investigate how the national system can best work with diverse MPA programs to develop performance measures that can be scaled-up from the site and regional levels, and how a participatory process can be designed that will have buy-in from member sites and programs. To meet this challenge, the Subcommittee will create a list of potential indicators appropriate at the site, regional and national scales, determine which indicators are scalable, and use a survey to determine whether or not there are scalable indicators of stakeholder and site manager engagement and/or support. The second question will focus on the social, economic, governance and cultural indicators that are appropriate for the national system. To shed light on this issue, the Subcommittee will convene an expert panel at the April 2009 meeting of the Committee to provide advice and recommend indicators. The third question relates to the process that NOAA and DOI should use to refine the priority conservation objectives in each region, which will be investigated using regional expert reviews and the expertise of interested Committee members. The final question will develop the parameters that should be included in the baseline for the national system. This was defined in the adopted recommendations; however, the Subcommittee will continue to explore future indicators, both in terms of output and outcome.

Committee Deliberations: Committee Business

A final issue discussed by the Committee concerned a letter drafted by Walter Pereyra, with input from other members, regarding plans by NMFS to consult with the Regional Fishery Management Councils during the process for nominating sites to the national system. The letter stated the concern of some members that the approach lacked transparency and that it represented a top-down approach. After much discussion of varying viewpoints, Dr. Pereyra moved to advise the MPA Center that the footnote on page 27 of the Framework be edited as follows (underlined words added):

“In most cases, management authority for an MPA lies with one agency or program; however, in certain instances, such as the federal/state National Estuarine Research Reserve System and state/tribe co-management arrangements, authority is formally shared or split among two or more entities. Similarly, Regional Fishery Management Councils have a unique role with the National Marine Fisheries Service in the process for establishing federal fishery management zones and federal fisheries habitat conservation zones. Where explicit agreements and/or legislation govern shared management authority or other formal relationships, the multiple managing entities will be consulted throughout the nomination process. The Regional Fishery Management Councils will be a key partner with NOAA in nominating sites to the National System. Through a transparent process, NOAA will consult with its Council partners and fully consider the views and interests of the Councils prior to nominating a site to the National System. These NOAA-Council consultations would take

place at the Regional-level at key stages of the nominating process, would be submitted jointly, and in the case of disagreement, DOC/NOAA would make final decisions on nominations.”

After considerable discussion, Ellen Goethel seconded the motion, which subsequently carried by majority vote.

The Committee adjourned the meeting at 4:00 P.M.

Committee members present:

Ms. Lori Arguelles
Mr. David Benton
Mr. Rick Gaffney
Dr. Steven Gaines
Ms. Ellen Goethel
Dr. Dennis Heinemann
Dr. Mark Hixon, Chair
Mr. Victor T. Mastone
Ms. Melissa Miller-Henson
Dr. Russell Moll
Dr. Elliott Norse
Mr. Terry O’Halloran
Mr. Alvin D. Osterback
Dr. Walter Pereyra
Mr. Eugenio Piñeiro Soler
Dr. Jim Ray
Captain Philip G. Renaud, USN (Ret.)
Mr. Jesús C. Ruiz
Mr. Joe Schumacker
Mr. Bruce A. Tackett
Mr. David H. Wallace
Mr. Robert Wargo
Mr. Bob Zales II, Vice Chair

Ex officio members/representatives present:

Dr. Kaush Arha, Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of Interior
Ms. Laura Furgione, Program Planning and Integration, NOAA
Mr. Steven Tucker, US Coast Guard / Department of Homeland Security
Mr. Chris German, US Coast Guard / Department of Homeland Security
Dr. Brian Melzian, US Environmental Protection Agency
Ms. Heather Sagar, National Marine Fisheries Service

Invited panelists and guests:

Mr. Timothy Keeney, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Oceans and Atmosphere
Mr. David Kennedy, Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management
Ms. Zdenka Willis, Integrated Ocean Observing Systems Office, NOAA

Dr. Cheri Recchia, Marine Protected Area Monitoring Enterprise, California
Dr. Brian Keller, NOAA Office of National Marine Sanctuaries
Mr. Paul Siri, Ocean Science Applications
Ms. Heather Kerkering, Central and Northern California Ocean Observation System
Dr. Gary Davis, formerly National Park Service
Mr. Bill Douros, Administrator, Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary

NOAA National Marine Protected Areas Center staff:

Mr. Joseph A. Uravitch, Director
Mr. Jason Blackburn, Detail
Mr. Jeffrey Harrison, Administrative Assistant
Ms. Rondi Robison, Conservation Planner
Ms. Kara Schwenke, Communications Coordinator
Dr. Charles Wahle, Senior Scientist
Ms. Lauren Wenzel, National System Coordinator
Ms. Katya Wowk, Knauss Fellow